arXiv:1203.4393v3 [math.CO] 13 Sep 2012

Minimum Number of k-Cliques in Graphs with Bounded Independence Number

Oleg Pikhurko*
Mathematics Institute
University of Warwick
Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

February 27, 2013

Abstract

Erdős asked in 1962 about the value of $f(n,k,l)$, the minimum number of k-cliques in a graph of order n and independence number less than l. The case $(k,l)=(3,3)$ was solved by Lorden. Here we solve the problem (for all large n) when (k,l) is $(3,4)$, $(4,3)$, $(5,3)$, $(6,3)$, and $(7,3)$. Independently, Das, Huang, Ma, Naves, and Sudakov did the cases $(k,l)=(3,4)$ and $(4,3)$. More recently, Vaughan solved the problem when $k=3$ and $5\le l\le 7$.

1 Introduction

First, let us give some definitions. Let K_k denote the complete graph on k vertices. For a graph $G=(V(G),E(G))$, let $\overline{G}=(V(G),\binom{V(G)}{2}\setminus E(G))$ denote its *complement* and $v(G)=|V(G)|$ denote its *order*. For graphs F and G with $v(F)\le v(G)$, let $P(F,G)$ be the number of $v(F)$-subsets of $V(G)$ that induce a subgraph isomorphic to F in G; furthermore, define the *density* of F in G as

$$p(F,G)=P(F,G)\binom{v(G)}{v(F)}^{-1}. \tag{1}$$

Let $\alpha(G)=\max\{l : P(\overline{K}_l,G)>0\}$ be the *independence number* of G.

Given a graph F on $[m]:=\{1,\dots,m\}$ and a sequence of integers $n_1,\dots,n_m$, let the *expansion* $F(\!(n_1,\dots,n_m)\!)$ be obtained by taking disjoint sets $V_1,\dots,V_m$ that have respectively $n_1,\dots,n_m$ vertices, putting the complete graph on each V_i, and putting, for each edge $\{i,j\}\in E(F)$, the complete bipartite graph between V_i and V_j. An expansion is *uniform* if $\big||V_i|-|V_j|\big|\le 1$ for any $i,j\in[m]$. If we consider expansion in terms of complements, then it amounts to blowing up each vertex i of $\overline{F}$ by factor n_i (and taking the complement of the obtained graph). Clearly, expansions cannot increase the independence number.

---

*Partially supported by the National Science Foundation, Grant DMS-1100215.

We consider the following extremal function

$$f(n,k,l) = \min\left\{P(K_k, G) : v(G) = n,\ \alpha(G) < l\right\},$$

that is, the minimum number of k-cliques in a graph with n vertices that does not contain $\overline{K}_l$. This function (in its full generality) was first defined by Erdős [6] in 1962.

Earlier, Goodman [9] determined $f(2n,3,3)$; his bounds also give the asymptotic value of $f(2n+1,3,3)$. Lorden [12] determined $f(n,3,3)$ and showed that the complement of $T_2(n)$ is the unique extremal graph when $n \geq 12$, where the *Turán graph* $T_m(n)$ is the complete m-partite graph on $[n]$ with parts being nearly equal. (In other words, $T_m(n)$ is the complement of the uniform expansion of $\overline{K}_m$.)

Erdős [6] asked if perhaps

$$f(n,k,l) = P(K_k, \overline{T}_{l-1}(n)), \tag{2}$$

that is, the uniform expansion of $\overline{K}_{l-1}$ gives the value of $f(n,k,l)$ and, specifically, if

$$f(3n,3,4) = 3\binom{n}{3}. \tag{3}$$

Nikiforov [13] showed that the limit

$$c_{k,l} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n,k,l)}{\binom{n}{k}} \tag{4}$$

exists for every pair (k,l) and that the lower bound $c_{k,l} \geq (l-1)^{1-k}$ given by the graphs $\overline{T}_{l-1}(n)$ as $n \to \infty$ can be sharp only for finitely many pairs (k,l). Thus, it was too optimistic to expect that (2) holds.

The main motivation of the papers [6, 9] comes from Ramsey's theorem [16] that implies that $f(n,k,l) > 0$ when $n \geq n_0(k,l)$ is sufficiently large. Both papers also considered the related problem of minimizing $p(K_k,G) + p(\overline{K}_k,G)$ over an (arbitrary) order-n graph G. The last question, known as the *Ramsey multiplicity problem*, attracted a lot of attention and led to many important developments.

On the other hand, the problem of determining $f(n,k,l)$ was rather neglected although it was mentioned in Bollobás' book [3, Problem 11 on Page 361] and Thomason's survey [19, Section 5.5]. One possible reason is that determining $c_{k,l}$, even for some small k and l, might require keeping track of too many different subgraph densities than what is practically feasible when doing calculations "by hand".

Razborov [17] introduced a powerful formal system for deriving inequalities between subgraph densities, where a computer can be used to do routine book-keeping. One aspect of his theory (introduced in [18]) allows us to numerically minimize linear combinations of subgraph densities by setting up and solving a semi-definite program. In some cases, the obtained numerical solution can be converted into a rigorous mathematical proof. Baber and Talbot [2] and Vaughan [20] (see [7, 8]) wrote an openly available code for doing such calculations.

By using Vaughan's package *Flagmatic* [20], we can solve the problem when n is large and $(k,l) = (3,4)$, $(4,3)$, $(5,3)$, $(6,3)$ and $(7,3)$. Independently, Das, Huang, Ma, Naves, and

Sudakov [5] solved the problem when n is large and $(k,l) = (3,4)$ and $(4,3)$, also by applying flag algebras. Later, Vaughan [21] solved the cases $(k,l) = (3,5)$, $(3,6)$, and $(3,7)$, again when n is large.

We state our results as three separate theorems.

Theorem 1 (Asymptotic Result)

$$\begin{aligned} c_{3,4} &= 1/9, & (5)\\ c_{4,3} &= 3/25, & (6)\\ c_{5,3} &= 31/5^4 \;=\; 31/625, & (7)\\ c_{6,3} &= 19211/2^{20} \;=\; 19211/1048576, & (8)\\ c_{7,3} &= 98491/2^{24} \;=\; 98491/16777216. & (9)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have in each of these cases that

$$f(n,k,l) = c_{k,l}\binom{n}{k} + O(n^{k-1}). \tag{10}$$

The upper bounds in (5), (6), and (7) are obtained by taking a uniform expansion of F, where F is respectively $\overline{K}_3$, the 5-cycle C_5, and (again) C_5. Easy calculations show that the density of k-cliques in these graphs is as required. These upper bounds on $c_{4,3}$ and $c_{5,3}$ come from Nikiforov [13]. In a subsequent paper [14], he also showed that an order-n graph G with $\alpha(G) < 3$ satisfies $P(K_4, G) \geq (\frac{3}{25} + o(1))\binom{n}{4}$ under the additional assumption that G is close to being regular.

The upper bounds in (8) and (9) come from a more complicated construction. The *Clebsch graph* L has binary 5-sequences of even *weight* (i.e. the number of entries equal to 1) for vertices, with two vertices being adjacent if the sum modulo 2 of the corresponding sequences has weight 4. It easily follows from this description that the Clebsch graph is vertex-transitive and triangle-free. For example, an automorphism that maps 00000 to 11000 is to flip the first two bits.

The complement $F = \overline{L}$ of the Clebsch graph is a 10-regular graph on 16 vertices. Take a uniform expansion F' of F of large order n. The limit of $p(K_k, F')$ as $n \to \infty$ is equal to the probability that, if we sample independent uniformly distributed vertices $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in V(L)$, they do not induce any edge in L. By the vertex-transitivity of L, we can fix $x_1 = 00000$. The Clebsch graph has the following maximal independent sets containing 00000: the sequences that we add to 00000 have weight 2, with the corresponding pairs of indices forming either the star with 4 edges or the triangle. There are 5 former sets and 10 latter sets, of sizes 5 and 4 respectively. A straightforward inclusion-exclusion counting shows that the above probability is

$$\frac{5 \cdot 5^{k-1} + 10 \cdot 4^{k-1} - 30 \cdot 3^{k-1} + 20 \cdot 2^{k-1} - 4}{16^{k-1}}.$$

By plugging $k = 6$ and 7, we get the upper bounds on $c_{k,3}$ stated in (8) and (9).

The upper bound in (10) follows by observing that if we pick a random injection $\boldsymbol{\phi} : [k] \to V(F')$, where F' a uniform expansion of F of order n, and condition on the restriction of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ to $[i]$

for $i < k$, then the probability that $\phi(i+1)$ belongs to a particular part of F' is $1/v(F)+O(1/n)$. Thus $p(K_k, F')$ is within additive term $O(1/n)$ from its limit as $n \to \infty$.

The lower bounds of Theorem 1 are proved in Section 2.

By inspecting the proof certificate returned by a flag algebra computation, one can often deduce further information about the structure of almost extremal graphs (see, for example, [4, 10, 15]). This also works here and we can establish the following results that apply when (k, l) is one of the pairs $(3, 4)$, $(4, 3)$, $(5, 3)$, $(6, 3)$, and $(7, 3)$, while F is respectively $\overline{K}_3$, C_5, C_5, $\overline{L}$, and $\overline{L}$.

Theorem 2 (Stability Property) *Let k, l, F be as above. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there are $\delta > 0$ and n_0 such that every graph G of order $n \geq n_0$ with $\alpha(G) < l$ and $P(K_k, G) \leq (c_{k,l}+\delta)\binom{n}{k}$ can be made isomorphic to a uniform expansion of F by changing at most $\varepsilon\binom{n}{2}$ edges.*

Theorem 3 (Exact Result) *Let k, l, F be as above. There is n_0 such that every graph G of order $n \geq n_0$ with $\alpha(G) < l$ and the minimum number of K_k-subgraphs contains an expansion $F' = F((V_1, \ldots, V_m))$ as a* spanning *subgraph (that is, $V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_m = V(G)$). Additionally, if $(k, l) = (3, 4)$ then $F' \cong \overline{T}_3(n)$ and $P(K_3, G) = P(K_3, F')$ (that is, by adding $E(G) \setminus E(F')$ we do not create any new triangles); in the other four cases we have $G = F'$.*

In particular, the last theorem proves (3) for all large n. Finally, let us remark that, as it was shown by Vaughan [21], the situation for $(k, l) = (3, 5)$, $(3, 6)$, and $(3, 7)$ is completely analogous to that for $(3, 4)$: $F(n, 3, l) = P(K_3, \overline{T}_{l-1}(n))$ for all large n and all extremal graphs contain $\overline{T}_{l-1}(n)$ as a spanning subgraph.

2 Lower Bounds in Theorem 1

2.1 Proof Certificates

As we have already mentioned, our lower bounds are proved with a help of computer by using flag algebras and semi-definite programming, see Razborov [17, 18]. This method is described in a number of research publications ([2, 7, 8, 17, 18]), so we will be brief.

The author used the *Flagmatic* package of Emil Vaughan (Version 1.5) that comes with a very clear and detailed user's guide [20]. Following Falgas-Ravry and Vaughan [7, 8] we present each proof by providing a certificate `cert.js` that can be checked using the script `inspect_certificate.py` that comes with *Flagmatic*. The documentation provided with *Flagmatic* [20] describes in detail how to do this.

Also, we include the transcript of each session where a certificate was generated, so that the reader can repeat our calculations. This may be helpful if the reader would like to experiment with the software by changing parameters (or to apply *Flagmatic* to some related problems).

These materials are available from the author's webpage as a single file:

`http://homepages.warwick.ac.uk/~maskat/Flk.tgz`

When one uncompresses the file, new directories are created, each for one pair (k, l). For example, `43/cert.js` and `43/transcript.txt` are respectively the certificate and the transcript of the session for the case $(k, l) = (4, 3)$.

Our presentation is different from that of Das et al [5] who worked hard on making their paper self-contained and the proof as human-readable as possible. This has many advantages (such as giving more insight into the problem) but makes the paper rather long. Our objective is to present formal rigorous proofs of all claimed results. We do so by describing the information that is contained in the certificates and by showing how it implies the stated results. While the certificates are not very suitable for direct inspection (some of them are very large and contain integers with hundreds of digits), the reader may verify all the required properties by using *Flagmatic* or by writing an independent script.

Let us give some definitions that are needed to describe the certificates.

Let us call a graph *admissible* if its independence number is less than l. A *type* is a pair (H, ϕ) where H is an admissible graph and $\phi : [v] \to V(H)$ is a bijection, where $v = v(H)$. Given a type $\tau = (H, \phi)$ as above, a *τ-flag* is a pair (G, ψ) where G is an admissible graph and $\psi : [v] \to V(G)$ is an injection such that $\psi \circ \phi^{-1} : V(H) \to V(G)$ is an *embedding* (that is, an injection that preserves both edges and non-edges). Informally, a τ-flag is a partially labeled graph such that the labeled vertices induce τ. The *order* $v(\tau)$ of τ is $v(H)$, the number of vertices in it.

For two τ-flags (G_1, ψ_1) and (G_2, ψ_2) with $n_1 \le n_2$ vertices, let $P((G_1, \psi_1), (G_2, \psi_2))$ be the number of n_1-subsets $X \subseteq V(G_2)$ such that $X \supseteq \psi_2([v])$ (i.e. X contains all labeled vertices) and the τ-flags (G_1, ψ_1) and $(G_2[X], \psi_2)$ are *isomorphic*, meaning that there is a graph isomorphism that preserves the labels. Also, define the *density*

$$p((G_1, \psi_1), (G_2, \psi_2)) = \frac{P((G_1, \psi_1), (G_2, \psi_2))}{\binom{n_2 - v}{n_1 - v}},$$

as the probability that be a random n_1-subset X of $V(G_2)$ with $X \supseteq \phi_2([v])$ induces a copy of the flag (G_1, ψ_1) in (G_2, ψ_2).

Now, we can present the information that is contained in each certificate `cert.js`.

First, the certificate lists all (up to an isomorphism) admissible N-vertex graphs for some integer N. Let us denote these graphs by $G_1, \dots, G_g$. Then the certificate describes some types $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_t$ such that their first components are pairwise non-isomorphic (as unlabeled graphs) and $N - v(\tau_i)$ is a positive even number for each $i \in [t]$.

The certificate contains, for each $i \in [t]$, the complete list $(F_1^{\tau_i}, \dots, F_{g_i}^{\tau_i})$ of all τ_i-flags (up to isomorphism of flags) with exactly $(N + v(\tau_i))/2$ vertices.

Also, for each $i \in [t]$, the certificate (indirectly) contains a symmetric $g_i \times g_i$-matrix Q^{τ_i}. More precisely, all our proofs are of this form: we have a diagonal matrix Q' all whose diagonal entries are positive rational numbers and a rational matrix R such that $Q^{\tau_i} = RQ'R^T$. This representation automatically implies that the matrix Q^{τ_i} is positive semi-definite.

Let G be an admissible graph of large order n. Initially, let $a = 0$. Let us do the following for each v such that $N - v$ is a positive even integer. Enumerate all $n(n-1)\dots(n-v+1)$

injections $\psi : [v] \to V(G)$. If the induced type $(G[\psi([v])], \psi)$ is equal to some τ_i, then we add $\mathbf{x}Q^{\tau_i}\mathbf{x}^T$ to a, where

$$\mathbf{x} = \left(P(F_1^{\tau_i}, (G, \psi)), \dots, P(F_{g_i}^{\tau_i}, (G, \psi))\right). \tag{11}$$

Since each Q^{τ_i} is positive semi-definite, we have that each $\mathbf{x}Q^{\tau_i}\mathbf{x} \geq 0$ and that the final a is non-negative.

If we sum the product $P(F_j^{\tau_i}, (G, \psi))\, P(F_h^{\tau_i}, (G, \psi))$ over all injections $\psi : [v] \to V(G)$ such that $(G[\psi([v])], \psi)$ is isomorphic to τ_i then, modulo an additive error term $O(n^{N-1})$, the result can be written as an explicit linear combination of the subgraph counts $P(G_1, G), \dots, P(G_g, G)$, see e.g. [17, Lemma 2.3]. Also, each Q^{τ_i} is an explicit matrix. Thus, if we expand each quadratic form $\mathbf{x}Q^{\tau_i}\mathbf{x}^T$ and take the sum over injections ψ, then we will get a representation

$$0 \leq \frac{a}{\binom{n}{N}} = O(1/n) + \sum_{i=1}^{g} \alpha_i p(G_i, G), \tag{12}$$

where each α_i is a rational number that does not depend on n and can be computed given the above information (types, flags, and matrices). An explicit formula for α_i is rather messy, so we do not state it.

The crucial property that our certificates possess is that

$$\alpha_i \leq p(K_k, G_i) - c'_{k,l}, \quad \text{for every } i \in [g], \tag{13}$$

where $c'_{k,l}$ is the right-hand side of the appropriate statement (5)–(9) (i.e. $c'_{k,l}$ is the lower bound on $c_{k,l}$ that we want to prove). This property (involving rational numbers) can be verified by the scripts that come with *Flagmatic* and use exact arithmetic. We refer the reader to *Flagmatic's* user guide [20].

If we assume that (13) holds, then we have, by Bayes' formula, that

$$p(K_k, G) - c'_{k,l} = \sum_{i=1}^{g} (p(K_k, G_i) - c'_{k,l}) p(G_i, G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{g} \alpha_i p(G_i, G) \geq -O(1/n). \tag{14}$$

Thus we derived not only $c_{k,l} \geq c'_{k,l}$ but also the claimed lower bound in (10).

At this point, we may stop and assume that Theorem 1 has been proved (modulo verifying all above claims by computer). However, it may be useful to say a few words how these certificates were obtained. Finding matrices $Q^{\tau_1}, \dots, Q^{\tau_t}$ amounts to solving a semi-definite program. The program is usually is quite large. So it is generated by computer as well; *Flagmatic* provides a highly customizable way of doing this. Then the obtained program is fed into an SDP-solver which return floating-point matrices. It is a good idea to start with as small as possible N and keep increasing it until the obtained (floating-point) bound seems to be equal to the conjectured value. The author found it beneficial, at this stage, to use the double-precision `spda_dd` solver that usually returns the correct values of around 20 first decimal digits.

In fact, this was how the extremal configuration for $c_{6,3}$ was discovered. The solver seemed to give the same bound $c_{6,3} \geq 19211/2^{20}$ for both $N = 7$ or 8. Here, the denominator is a high power of 2. This suggested that an extremal configuration can be a uniform expansion of a graph with 16 vertices and made the author to look at such graphs.

The user guide of *Flagmatic* describes a standard procedure for converting the obtained floating-point matrices into those that satisfy (13) exactly. This process, that also uses a computer, sometimes requires adjusting various parameters and options.

One strategy, once N has been fixed, is to reduce the number of types as much as possible by re-running the SDP-solver and checking that we still seem to get the same bound. Note that $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_t$ need not enumerate all types. The removal of some type τ effectively means that we make the corresponding matrix Q^τ to be identically 0.

Another useful trick comes from the following observation.

Lemma 4 *Suppose that we have a flag algebra proof as specified above that the upper bound on $c_{k,l}$ is given by uniform expansions of a $\overline{K}_l$-free graph F. Fix $i \in [t]$. Let $\tau_i = (H, \phi)$, and $v = v(\tau_i)$. Let n be large and G be a uniform expansion of F of order n. Let $\psi : [v] \to V(G)$ be an injection such that $\psi \circ \phi^{-1}$ is an embedding of H into G. Define $\mathbf{x}$ by (11). Then $\mathbf{x} Q^{\tau_i} \mathbf{x}^T = O(n^{N-v-1})$.*

Proof. Since each part V_i of G is homogeneous, any modification of the injection ψ such that its values stay in the same parts is an embedding. These new injections give the same vector $\mathbf{x}$. Thus, with $m = v(F)$,

$$0 \le \left(\frac{n}{m} + O(1)\right)^v \mathbf{x} Q^{\tau_i} \mathbf{x}^T \le a.$$

Let us run our flag algebra proof on G. It shows that $p(K_k, G) \ge c_{k,l} + a/\binom{n}{N} + O(1/n)$. Also, as we have previously remarked, $p(K_k, G)$ deviates from $c_{k,l}$ by at most $O(1/n)$. We conclude that $a = O(n^{N-1})$, implying the lemma. ∎

Thus, when we let $n \to \infty$, then the normalized limit of $\mathbf{x}$ is a zero eigenvector of Q^{τ_i}. We call such an eigenvector $\mathbf{x}$ *forced*. By inspecting the graph F that gives the upper bound in Theorem 1, we can find all forced eigenvectors. This makes our task easier because we have to "guess" fewer parameters now.

Lemma 4 can be generalized to many other problems. This idea was first used by Razborov [18]. In fact, *Flagmatic* extracts forced vectors (when F is supplied) and relies on them when constructing the matrices Q' and R.

Below we mention briefly how this "rounding" process went in each case and what further actions (if any) were needed.

2.2 $(k, l) = (4, 3)$ or $(5, 3)$

The procedure worked without any issues with these two cases. In both cases, we used the 6-vertex universe that contains 38 triangle-free graphs.

2.3 $(k, l) = (3, 4)$

The author initially had difficulties with converting the numerical bound into a proof. First, by experimenting, the number of types t was reduced from 5 to 3. The obtained floating-point matrices seemed to have extra zero eigenvectors that were not forced and were missed by the script `make_zero_eigenvectors.py`. So these were just guessed by the author. Instead of a call to the above script, we enter the corresponding data manually, which can be seen in the transcript. All other stages of obtaining a certificate went without any problem.

2.4 $(k, l) = (6, 3)$ or $(7, 3)$

In these cases, we found it more convenient to work with the complements: we forbid K_3 but try to minimize the density of $\overline{K}_k$ for $k = 6, 7$.

These cases went through without any big problems. One issue was that the Clebsch graph has 16 vertices. So some modifications were needed in various scripts to overcome the current limitation of Version 1.5 of *Flagmatic* that a graph can have at most 9 vertices. Also, the scripts that came with *Flagmatic* were too slow for our 16-vertex construction. (Since all previous cases done in [7, 8] had small number of parts, the speed of scripts that deal with constructions was never an issue.)

It is not hard to check that the Clebsch graph is 3-*transitive*, that is, for any ordered triples of vertices (x_1, x_2, x_3) and (y_1, y_2, y_3) that induce the same adjacencies there is an automorphism that maps each x_i to y_i. This allowed the author to speed up calculations by introducing some minor modifications into the original scripts. Instead of the modified scripts, we include the files `63/zev.py` and `73/zev.py` that contain all needed zero eigenvectors, so that the reader can repeat our calculations by running the original scripts and using the commands from the transcripts. Let us stress that the obtained certificate can be checked by the original (unmodified) script `inspect_certificate.py`.

While $c_{6,3}$ could be computed by using graphs with at most 7 vertices, it seems that the determination of $c_{7,3}$ by this method requires 8-vertex graphs. Not all types are needed and, as the reader can see from the transcript, we removed those ones for which the corresponding semi-definite matrix had large dimensions. Still, the current certificate for $c_{7,3}$ is quite unwieldy, occupying about 140 Mb of disk space when uncompressed.

3 Proving the Stability Property

Here we prove Theorem 2. Our proof is similar in spirit to the proof of Theorem 2 in [15]. Let (k, l) and F be as in the theorem. Let $N = N(k, l)$ be the number of vertices that was used in the flag algebra proof of Section 2; thus $N(3, 4) = 5$, $N(4, 3) = N(5, 3) = 6$, $N(6, 3) = 7$, and $N(7, 3) = 8$.

Suppose on the contrary that there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for infinitely many $n \to \infty$ there is a graph G of order n such that $\alpha(G) < l$ and $p(K_k, G) = c_{k,l} + o(1)$ but G is $\varepsilon\binom{n}{2}$-far from a uniform expansion of F. Let n be large, G be as above, and $V = V(G)$.

Let $i \in [g]$. Call the admissible graph G_i (that has N vertices) *singular* if G_i is not contained as an induced subgraph in any expansion of F. Let us call G_i *sharp* if (13) is equality. The script `inspect_certificate.py` returns all sharp graphs. The following easy observation is well known.

Lemma 5 *Let $i \in [g]$. If G_i is not sharp, then $p(G_i, G) = o(1)$.*

Proof. Note that we have already established that $c'_{k,l} = c_{k,l}$. By (14), we have

$$p(K_k, G) - c_{k,l} \geq (p(K_k, G_i) - c_{k,l} - \alpha_i)p(G_i, G) + O(1/n).$$

Since G is almost extremal, we have $p(K_k, G) - c_{k,l} = o(1)$. The lemma clearly follows. ▮

3.1 $(k, l) = (4, 3)$ or $(5, 3)$

Let $l = 3$ and $k = 4$ or 5. Here F is the 5-cycle C_5.

The script `inspect_certificate.py` returns the list of all sharp graphs on $N = 6$ vertices. This can be compared with the list of graphs of order N that occur with positive density in the expansion of F by using `check_construction.py`. The outputs (and calls to these scripts with the complete set of options) can be found in the transcripts. We see that each of the lists contains 17 graphs. By Lemma 5 the latter list is a subset of the former; thus they coincide.

Again by Lemma 5, we conclude that $p(H, G) = o(1)$ for every singular H. The Induced Removal Lemma of Alon, Fischer, Krivelevich, and Szegedy [1] implies that we can change $o(n^2)$ edges in G and destroy all singular graphs and, additionally, preserve the property $p(\overline{K}_l, G) = 0$ (that is, $\alpha(G) < l$). Since changing $o(n^2)$ edges affects each $p(H, G)$ by $o(1)$, we can assume that G itself does not contain any singular induced subgraph. This means the following.

Claim 6 *For any subset $U \subseteq V(G)$ with at most 6 vertices there is a partition $U = U_1 \cup \cdots \cup U_5$ such that $G[U] = F(\!(U_1, \ldots, U_5)\!)$.* ▮

By the Induced Removal Lemma we can additionally assume that either the density of C_5 is $\Omega(1)$ or we do not have a single induced 5-cycle in G.

Claim 7 *$p(C_5, G) = \Omega(1)$.*

Proof of Claim. Suppose on the contrary that G does not contain an induced pentagon. Take a longest induced path $(u_1, \ldots, u_s)$. By Claim 6, we have $s \leq 4$. Also, $s \geq 3$ for otherwise G is the union of disjoint cliques, there can be at most two of them, and the K_k-density is at least $1/2^{k-1} + o(1)$, contradicting the minimality of G. Every other vertex sends at least one edge to $U = \{u_1, \ldots . u_s\}$ by Claim 6 because this property involving at most 5 vertices holds for any expansion of C_5. It follows, again by Claim 6, that all vertices of G fall into one of s classes, with G itself being an expansion of the order-s path. We can make G into the union of two disjoint cliques by removing some edges. This cannot increase the density of K_k and, as we have just seen, leads to a contradiction. ▮

So suppose that $u_0, \ldots, u_4 \in V(G)$ span an induced pentagon with $\{u_i, u_{i+1}\} \in E(G)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_5$, where $\mathbb{Z}_5$ denotes the residues modulo 5. Let $U = \{u_0, \ldots, u_4\}$.

Claim 8 *For any $u \in V(G) \setminus U$ there is $j \in \mathbb{Z}_5$ such that $\{u, u_i\} \in E(G)$ if and only if $i \in \{j-1, j, j+1\}$.*

Proof of Claim. Take the partition $U \cup \{u\} = U_0 \cup \cdots \cup U_4$ given by Claim 6. For every distinct $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_5$, the vertices u_i and u_j have different neighborhoods in $U \setminus \{u_i, u_j\}$, so they belong to different parts. Without loss of generality assume that $u_i \in U_i$ for each i. If the vertex u belongs to U_j, then the neighbors of u are u_{j-1}, u_j, u_{j+1}, as required. ▌

Claim 8 gives a partition of $V(G)$ into 5 parts $U_0, \ldots, U_4$ where

$$U_i = \{u_i\} \cup \{u \in V(G) \setminus U : \Gamma_G(u) \cap U = \{u_{i-1}, u_i, u_{i+1}\}\},$$

where $\Gamma_H(x)$ denote the neighborhood of a vertex x in a graph H.

Claim 9 *For every $i \in \mathbb{Z}_5$ the induced subgraph $G[U_i]$ is complete.*

Proof of Claim. Take any distinct $u, v \in U_i$, say $i = 0$. By the definition of U_i, we have that $v, u_1, \ldots, u_4$ span an induced 5-cycle. Also, u is adjacent to u_4 and u_1. By Claim 8 we conclude that $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$. ▌

Claim 10 *Let $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_5$ be distinct and let $v_i \in U_i$ and $v_j \in U_j$ be arbitrary. Then v_i and v_j are adjacent if and only if $i = j \pm 1$.*

Proof of Claim. For example, let $i = 0$ and $j = 1$. The vertex $v_1 \in U_1$ is adjacent to the vertices u_1 and u_2 but not to u_3 of the 5-cycle on $v_0, u_1, \ldots, u_4$. By Claim 8, v_1 and v_0 are adjacent. ▌

Thus we see that G is exactly an expansion of C_5 with parts $U_0, \ldots, U_4$, as required. Choose an arbitrary subsequence of n such that each $|U_i|/n$ approaches some limit α_i. It remains to show that each $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{5}$. One approach to showing this would be to argue that an explicit degree-k polynomial, that approximates $p(K_k, G)$, has the unique minimizer $(\frac{1}{5}, \ldots, \frac{1}{5})$. This approach seems rather messy.

However, there is another way of getting the desired conclusion, namely, by applying Lemma 4. Let us consider type τ_6 which is obtained by labeling the vertices of the 3-edge path by 3, 1, 2, 4 as we go along the path. There are exactly 8 non-isomorphic τ_6-flags on 5 vertices that we denote by $F_1^{\tau_6}, \ldots, F_8^{\tau_6}$. Three of these flags, labeled by *Flagmatic* as $F_6^{\tau_6}, F_7^{\tau_6}, F_8^{\tau_6}$, do not embed into any expansion of C_5 when we view them as unlabeled graphs. Thus, by Claim 6, we have that $p(F_i^{\tau_6}, (G, \phi)) = 0$ for every ϕ and $i = 6, 7, 8$. The remaining five τ_6-flags have the property that for every $\psi : [4] \to V(G)$ with the induced flag $(G[\psi([4])], \psi)$ being isomorphic to τ_6, the vector $\mathbf{x}$ defined by (11) is a permutation of $(\alpha_1 n + O(1), \ldots, \alpha_5 n + O(1), 0, 0, 0)$. Thus, by Lemma 4, some permutation of $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_5, 0, 0, 0)$ is a zero eigenvector of Q^{τ_6}. On the other hand, $(1,1,1,1,1,0,0,0)$ is a forced eigenvector. Moreover, a simple modification (included in the archive `Fkl.tgz`) of Flagmatic's `inspect_certificate` allows us to verify that the rank of the rational 8×8-matrix Q^{τ_6} is exactly 7 (so its null-space has dimension 1). Since $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_5 = 1$, we conclude that each $\alpha_i = \frac{1}{5}$, giving the desired stability property.

3.2 $(k,l) = (3,4)$

Here $N = 5$. By applying the Induced Regularity Lemma, we can assume that G does not contain a 5-vertex graph that is not sharp. The transcript shows there are 10 sharp graphs while an expansion of $\overline{K}_3$ has at most five different 5-vertex subgraphs.

Thus we cannot immediately assume that every 5-vertex subgraph of G embeds into an expansion of $\overline{K}_3$. Nonetheless, the proof can be completed with little extra work.

An inspection of the list of sharp graphs shows that there are only two singular sharp graphs that contain K_3: K_3 with a 2-edge path attached and K_4 with a pendant edge. One consequence is that if two triangles in G intersect, then their union spans a clique. Thus we can define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on vertices of G, where $x \sim y$ if and only if $x = y$ or there is a chain of intersecting triangles in G that connects x to y. This equivalence relation splits $V(G)$ into parts $U_1, \ldots, U_s$ that induce cliques and a set $U_0 \subseteq V(G)$ that does not induce any triangle. Since G does not contain $\overline{K}_4$, we have that $|U_0| + 1$ is at most the Ramsey number $R(3,4) = 9$ so we can ignore U_0.

Also, each U_i sends at most one edge to $V(G) \setminus U_i$ which again can be derived by looking at singular graphs that contain a triangle. This property and the $\overline{K}_4$-freeness of G imply that $s \le 3$. (Note that each U_i has at least 3 vertices.) A simple optimization shows that, in fact, $s = 3$ and each U_i has $(\frac{1}{3} + o(1))n$ vertices. This proves the stability property for $f(n,3,4)$.

3.3 $(k,l) = (6,3)$ or $(7,3)$

Let N be as above, that is, $N = 7$ if $k = 6$ and $N = 8$ if $k = 7$. Let G be a K_3-free graph of large order n with $p(\overline{K}_k, G) = c_{k,l} + o(1)$. Recall that, for notational convenience, we prefer to work with the graph complements in these cases.

The transcripts show that the number of sharp graphs equals the number of N-vertex graphs that appear in an expansion of the Clebsch graph (namely 86 graphs for $(k,N) = (6,7)$ and 232 graphs for $(k,N) = (7,8)$). By Lemma 5 these two lists coincide. As before, by applying the Induced Removal Lemma we can assume that G has the following property:

Claim 11 *No singular graph is an induced subgraph of G.* ▮

We need some further definitions before we can proceed with the proof.

Let C_5' be obtained from the 5-cycle on $x_1, \ldots, x_5$ by adding an extra isolated vertex x_0. Let $X \subseteq V(H)$ be a subset of vertices in some graph H. Two vertices $x, y \in V(H)$ are X*-equivalent*, denoted as $x \sim_X y$, if $\Gamma_H(x) \cap X = \Gamma_H(y) \cap X$, that is, if they are adjacent to the same vertices of X. Note that we allow x or y to belong to X and it is possible that some $x \in X$ and $y \notin X$ are X-equivalent. Clearly, $\sim_X$ is an equivalence relation. Let $[x]_X = \{y \in V(H) : y \sim_X x\}$ denote the equivalence class of x. Also, call a map $\phi : V(H) \to V(H')$ a *strong homomorphism* of a graph H into a graph H' if it preserves both edges and non-edges (but ϕ need not be injective).

Claim 12 *Let ϕ be a strong homomorphism of C_5' into the Clebsch graph L and let $X = \phi(V(C_5'))$. Then the following claims hold.*

1. *For every strong homomorphism ψ of C_5' into L, there is an automorphism σ of L such that $\phi = \sigma \circ \psi$. In particular, ψ is injective.*
2. *The X-equivalence relation is trivial on $V(L)$, that is, $x \sim_X y$ if and only if $x = y$.*
3. *For every two distinct vertices $x, y \in V(L)$ there is $z \in X \setminus \{\phi(x_0)\}$ such that, for $Z = X \setminus \{z\}$, we have $x \not\sim_Z y$ and the bipartite subgraph of L induced by $[x]_Z$ and $[y]_Z$ is either complete or empty.*

Proof of Claim. Up to an automorphism of L, each strong homomorphism ϕ is as follows. By the vertex-transitivity of L, we can assume that $\phi(x_0) = 00000$. Thus every other vertex of C_5' has to be mapped to a sequence of weight 2. (No other vertex can be mapped to 00000 because x_0 is the unique isolated vertex of C_5'.) By permuting indices $1, \ldots, 5$ (which gives an automorphism of L), we can assume that $\phi(x_1) = 00011$. Next, up to a permutation of indices $1, 2, 3$, we can assume that $\phi(x_2) = 01100$ and $\phi(x_5) = 11000$. Up to a transposition of 4 and 5, let $\phi(x_3) = 10001$. Now, $\phi(x_4) = 00110$ is uniquely determined. This proves the first part of the claim.

Let ϕ be as above; thus

$$X = \{00011, 01100, 10001, 00110, 11000, 00000\}. \tag{15}$$

Every 5-sequence of weight 0, 4 and 2 sends respectively 0, 3, and 1–2 edges to X, so X distinguishes vertices of different weight. An easy case analysis for each possible weight shows the second part of the claim.

In order to establish the third part, we use the fact that any cyclic permutation or the reversal of the indices preserves X. Up to these symmetries, there are 12 different unordered pairs x, y to check. The following table lists a vertex z that establishes the claim and the

Z-equivalence classes of x and y, where $Z = X \setminus \{z\}$:

x	y	z	$[x]_Z$	$[y]_Z$
00000	00011	10001	$\{00000, 01010\}$	$\{00011\}$
00000	00101	00011	$\{00000, 10100\}$	$\{00101\}$
00000	01111	00011	$\{00000, 10100\}$	$\{01111\}$
00011	01100	00110	$\{00011\}$	$\{10100\}$
00011	00110	00011	$\{00011\}$	$\{00110\}$
00011	00101	00011	$\{00011\}$	$\{00101\}$
00011	01010	00110	$\{00011\}$	$\{01010\}$
00011	10100	10001	$\{00011\}$	$\{01100, 10100\}$
00101	01010	00110	$\{00101\}$	$\{01010\}$
00101	01001	00110	$\{00101\}$	$\{00000, 01001\}$
01111	10111	00011	$\{01111\}$	$\{10111\}$
01111	11011	00011	$\{01111\}$	$\{11011\}$

Alternatively, the included *Mathematica* notebook `scripts/Clebsch.nb` contains a function that verifies the existence of z by the brute-force enumeration of all cases. ∎

Claim 13 $P(C_5', G) = \Omega(n^6)$.

Proof of Claim. While it might be possible to do this similarly to Claim 7, the simplest way is probably to let *Flagmatic* prove some lower bound on the density of $\overline{K}_k$ given that both K_3 and C_5' are forbidden. The obtained bound (with the certificates `63/subproblem/cert.js` and `73/subproblem/cert.js`) is larger than $c_{k,3}$. This implies the claim by the Induced Removal Lemma. ∎

Fix one embedding ϕ of C_5' into G. Let us view C_5' as the subgraph of L induced by $X \subseteq V(L)$, where $X = V(C_5')$ is defined by (15). Let $Y = \phi(X)$. Partition the vertices of G into Y-equivalence classes.

Claim 14 *The number of Y-equivalence classes in G is at most 16.*

Proof of Claim. For every vertex $y \in V(G)$, the subgraph $H = G[Y \cup \{y\}]$, that has at most $7 \leq N$ vertices, admits an embedding into an expansion of the Clebsch graph by Claim 11. This implies that there is a strong homomorphism ϕ from H into L. By Part 2 of Claim 12, ϕ is unique (up to an isomorphism of L). There are at most 16 options for $\phi(y)$, giving the claim. ∎

For $y \in V(G)$, identify the (unique) vertex $x \in V(L)$ whose adjacecies to X match those of y to Y (i.e. $\phi(\Gamma_L(x) \cap X) = \Gamma_G(y) \cap Y$), and label the Y-equivalence class containing y by U_x. In particular, for each $x \in X$, the part containing $\phi(x)$ is labeled by U_x.

Claim 15 *For every adjacent $x, y \in V(L)$, the induced bipartite subgraph $G[U_x, U_y]$ is complete. For non-adjacent $x, y \in V(L)$ the induced bipartite subgraph $G[U_x, U_y]$ is empty. (In particular, each part U_x is an independent set.)*

Proof of Claim. Let x, y be adjacent. Let $x' \in U_x$ and $y' \in U_y$ be arbitrary.

Pick $z \in X$ given by Part 3 of Claim 12 and let $Z = X \setminus \{z\}$. The subgraph $H = G[\phi(Z) \cup \{x', y'\}]$ has at most $7 \leq N$ vertices. By Claim 11, H admits a strong homomorphism ψ into L. By Part 1 of Claim 12, we can assume that $\psi \circ \phi$ is the identity on Z. Then ψ maps x' into $[x]_Z$ and y' into $[y]_Z$. However, the bipartite subgraph induced by $[x]_Z$ and $[y]_Z$ in L is complete by the choice of z (and since $\{x, y\} \in E(L)$). Thus x' and y' are adjacent. The other parts of the claim follow in a similar manner. ▌

Thus we know that G is an expansion of L. It remains to argue that each part U_x has $(\frac{1}{16} + o(1))n$ vertices.

Let $k = 7$. We consider the type τ_{25}, which is a labeling of C_5'. The transcript shows that the 22×22-matrix $Q^{\tau_{25}}$ has rank 21. Moreover, it has one forced zero eigenvector consisting of 16 entries equal 1/16 and six entries equal 0. We get the desired conclusion from Claim 13, similarly as we did in Section 3.2.

Let $k = 6$. We consider the type $\tau_5 = (H, \phi)$, where H consists of the 3-edge path plus an isolated vertex. Since C_5' contains H as a subgraph, Claim 13 implies that $P(H, G) = \Omega(n^5)$. The transcript shows that the 16×16-matrix Q^{τ_5} has rank 15. Moreover, it has one forced zero eigenvector that has 10 entries equal 1/16 and 3 entries equal 2/16. This implies that some 10 parts have sizes $(\frac{1}{16} + o(1))n$ while the remaining parts come in 3 pairs, each pair having $(\frac{2}{16} + o(1))n$ vertices. By Part 1 of Claim 12, we can relabel parts so that the embedding of τ_5 that gives this distribution has vertices in parts $U_{00011}, U_{01100}, U_{10001}, U_{00110}, U_{00000}$. In this case, we can indentify the three pairs of parts whose sizes are still undetermined as

$$\{U_{00000}, U_{00101}\}, \quad \{U_{00011}, U_{10010}\}, \quad \{U_{00110}, U_{01010}\}. \tag{16}$$

The other 10 parts, each of size $(\frac{1}{16} + o(1))n$, contain many copies of H, e.g. via

$$U_{10100}, U_{01111}, U_{11000}, U_{10111}, U_{11101}.$$

The adjacenty pattern to these $(\frac{n}{16} + o(n))^5$ copies H uniquely identifies parts U_{00000}, U_{00101}, U_{00011} and U_{01010}. Lemma 4 implies that each of these parts has size $(\frac{1}{16} + o(1))n$, establishing the stability property.

Remark. By running everything with $N = 8$, it is possible to shorten the "human" part of the proof of Theorem 2 for $(k, l) = (3, 6)$. (Namely, Part 3 of Claim 12 becomes redundant.) However, we believe that the ability to solve this case within the universe of 7-vertex graphs justifies the extra work and the idea of excluding some vertex z in Claim 15 may be useful for other problems.

4 Exact Result

First, we present a rather general Theorem 16 and then verify in Section 4.2 that it implies Theorem 3. Theorem 16 can in principle be strengthened in some ways but we state only the current version as it suffices for all the cases that we need.

4.1 A General Result

We need to give some definitions first, given an arbitrary pair (k,l) and any admissible graph F with vertex set $[m]$.

We say that F is a *stability graph* for (k,l) if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there are n_0 and $\delta > 0$ such that the following holds. Let G be an arbitrary graph such that $n = v(G) \geq n_0$, $\alpha(G) < l$, and $p(K_k, G) \leq c_{k,l} + \delta$. Then there is a partition $V(G) = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_m$ such that the part sizes differ at most by 1 and

$$|E(F(\!(V_1,\ldots,V_m)\!)) \bigtriangleup E(G)| \leq \varepsilon \binom{n}{2}.$$

Informally speaking, F is a stability graph for (k,l) if every large almost extremal graph for the $f(n,k,l)$-problem is $o(n^2)$-close in the edit distance to a uniform expansion of F. Clearly, this property is preserved if we replace F by an isomorphic graph or by $F(\!(U_1,\ldots,U_m)\!)$ with $|U_1| = \cdots = |U_m| > 0$.

Let us call a set of vertices $X \subseteq [m]$ *admissible* if $F - X$ does not contain $\overline{K}_{l-1}$. Let the *gradient* $\mathrm{grad}(X)$ of X be the probability, when we pick $k-1$ independent and uniformly distributed vertices $x_1,\ldots,x_{k-1} \in [m]$, that all belong to X and for every $i,j \in [k-1]$ the vertices x_i and x_j are adjacent or equal. Let us call a stability graph F *strict* if $\mathrm{grad}(X) > c_{k,l}$ for every admissible X for which there is no $i \in [m]$ with $X = \hat{\Gamma}_F(i)$. Here

$$\hat{\Gamma}_F(i) = \{i\} \cup \{j \in V(F) : \{i,j\} \in E(F)\}$$

is the *closed neighborhood* of i in F. These definitions are motivated by the addition of a new vertex x to $F' = F(\!(V_1,\ldots,V_m)\!)$ where $|V_1| = \cdots = |V_m| = n$ is large and x is adjacent to $\cup_{i\in X} V_i$. The new graph is still $\overline{K}_l$-free if and only if X is admissible. Also, the number of k-cliques that contain x is $\mathrm{grad}(X)\binom{mn}{k-1} + O(n^{k-2})$. If $X = \hat{\Gamma}_F(i)$, then adding x is the same as enlarging the part V_i by one vertex and, if F is a stability graph, then the number of k-cliques increases by $c_{k,l}\binom{mn}{k-1} + O(n^{k-2})$, see Claim 19 below. Thus F is strict if the number of the new k-cliques is by $\Omega(n^{k-1})$ larger for every other admissible X.

Theorem 16 *Let a pair (k,l) admit a stability graph F which is strict. Then there is n_0 such that every graph G with $n = v(G) \geq n_0$, $\alpha(G) < l$, and $P(K_k, G) = f(n,k,l)$ contains an expansion of F as a spanning subgraph so that, moreover, no k-clique of G uses an edge which is not in the expansion.*

Proof. Let $V(F) = [m]$. Choose positive constants $\varepsilon_2 \gg \varepsilon_1 \gg \varepsilon_0 \gg 1/n_0 > 0$, each being sufficiently small depending on the previous ones.

Since there are finitely many different subsets $X \subseteq [m]$, we can assume that

$$\mathrm{grad}(X) \geq c_{k,l} + 2km\varepsilon_2 \tag{17}$$

for every admissible X that is not the closed neighborhood of some vertex. Also, we assume that for every $n \geq n_0$ we have

$$f(n,k,l) \geq (c_{k,l} - \varepsilon_0)\binom{n}{k}, \tag{18}$$

Let us show that n_0 satisfies the conclusion of the theorem. Let G be an arbitrary $f(n,k,l)$-extremal graph with $n \geq n_0$ vertices. Let $V = V(G)$. Since $f(n,k,l) = (c_{k,l} + o(1))\binom{n}{k}$ by (4) and n_0 is sufficiently large, we have that

$$|E(G) \bigtriangleup E(F')| \leq \varepsilon_0 \binom{n}{2} \tag{19}$$

for some uniform expansion $F' = F(\!(V_1, \ldots, V_m)\!)$ on V.

We are going to modify the partition $V = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_m$. Given a current partition, let $B = E(F') \setminus E(G)$ and $S = E(G) \setminus E(F')$. We call the pairs in B *bad* and those in S *superfluous.*

Iteratively repeat the following operation as long as possible: if we can move some vertex x of F' to another part and decrease the number of bad pairs by least $\varepsilon_1 n$, then we perform this move.

Since we had initially at $\varepsilon_0\binom{n}{2}$ bad pairs, we perform at most $\varepsilon_0\binom{n}{2}/\varepsilon_1 n < \varepsilon_1 n/4$ moves. Let $V_1, \ldots, V_m, F', B, S$ refer to the final configuration. What we have achieved is that for every vertex $x \in V_i$ and any $j \in [m]$

$$|\Gamma_{\overline{G}}(x) \cap \cup_{h \in \hat{\Gamma}_F(j)} V_h| > |\Gamma_{\overline{G}}(x) \cap \cup_{h \in \hat{\Gamma}_F(i)} V_h| - \varepsilon_1 n. \tag{20}$$

Also, the current expansion F' is not far from being uniform:

$$\left| |V_i| - \frac{n}{m} \right| \leq \varepsilon_1 n, \quad \text{for all } i \in [m]. \tag{21}$$

Also, we have

$$\left|E(G) \bigtriangleup E(F')\right| \leq \varepsilon_0 \binom{n}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon_1 n}{4}\, n < \varepsilon_1 \binom{n}{2}. \tag{22}$$

Claim 17 *The removal of any edge $\{x,y\}$ from F' creates $\overline{K}_l$.*

Proof of Claim. First, suppose that x and y belong the same part V_i. Partition $V_i = X \cup Y$ into two almost equal parts such that $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. Let F'' be obtained from F' by removing all edges between X and Y. We have, very roughly,

$$\begin{aligned} P(K_k, F'') &\leq P(K_k, F') - \frac{1}{2^k}\binom{|V_i|}{k} \\ &\leq P(K_k, G) + \varepsilon_1 \binom{n}{2}\binom{n-2}{k-2} - \frac{n^k}{(3m)^k k!} \ < \ P(K_k, G). \end{aligned}$$

By the extremality of G, we conclude that F'' contains an independent set I of size l. Clearly, I has exactly one vertex in each X and Y. Since both X and Y are homogeneous, we can assume that $x, y \in I$, giving the required.

If x, y come from different parts V_i and V_j, then a similar argument works where we remove all edges from F' between V_i and V_j. ▌

Claim 18 *For every bad pair $\{x_1, x_2\} \in B$ we have $d_S(x_1) + d_S(x_2) \geq n/3m^{l-2}$.*

Proof of Claim. Let $x_1 \in V_{i_1}$ and $x_2 \in V_{i_2}$. By Claim 17, $F' - \{x_1, x_2\}$ has $\overline{K}_l$ as a subgraph. This means that we can find distinct $i_3, \ldots, i_k \in [m] \setminus \{i_1, i_2\}$ such that no pair of vertices $i_1, \ldots, i_l$, except perhaps $\{i_1, i_2\}$, is adjacent in F.

For every choice of $\mathbf{x} = (x_3, \ldots, x_l)$ such that $x_j \in V_{i_j}$, at least one pair $\{x_i, x_j\}$ with $1 \le i < j \le l$ is superfluous (for otherwise we get an independent set of size l in G). It is impossible that both i and j are at least 3 for at least half of the choices of $\mathbf{x}$: otherwise each superfluous pair is overcounted at most $2n^{l-4}$ times and we have

$$|S| \ge \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{n}{2m}\right)^{l-2} \frac{1}{2n^{l-4}} > \varepsilon_1 \binom{n}{2},$$

which contradicts (22). Thus, for at least half of the choices of $\mathbf{x}$ there is a superfluous pair intersecting $\{x_1, x_2\}$. Since each such pair is over-counted at most n^{l-3} times, we obtain that

$$d_S(x_1) + d_S(x_2) \ge \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(\frac{1}{m} - \varepsilon_1 \right) n \right)^{l-2} \times \frac{1}{n^{l-3}},$$

which implies the claim as $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(m, l)$ is small. ▌

Let $P(K_k^1, (H, x))$ denote the number of k-cliques in a graph H that contain $x \in V(H)$.

Claim 19 *For any two vertices $x, y \in V$, we have*

$$\left| P(K_k^1, (G, x)) - P(K_k^1, (G, y)) \right| \le \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

Proof. If we delete x but add a clone y' of y (putting an edge between y and y'), then we do not create a copy of $\overline{K}_l$ while the number of k-cliques changes by at most $P(K_k^1, (G, y)) - P(K_k^1, (G, x)) + \binom{n-2}{k-2}$. Since G is extremal, this has to be non-negative. By reversing the roles of x and y, we derive the claim. ▌

Suppose that $B \ne \emptyset$ for otherwise we are done: then we have $G \supseteq F'$ and, by comparing the extremal graph G with F', we conclude that no superfluous edge of G can belong to a k-clique.

By Claim 18, there is a vertex x whose S-degree is at least $n/6m^{l-2}$. Define

$$X = \{i \in [m] : |\Gamma_B(x) \cap V_i| \le \varepsilon_2 n\}.$$

Suppose that X not admissible. Then there are distinct $i_1, \ldots, i_{l-1} \in [m] \setminus X$ that span $\overline{K}_{l-1}$ in F. Let $x_l = x$. For every choice of $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{l-1})$ with $x_j \in \Gamma_B(x) \cap V_{i_j}$, the $(l-1)$-set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_{l-1}\}$ has to span an edge in G (otherwise it together with x induces $\overline{K}_l$). This edge is necessarily in S. On the other hand, any pair in S is over-counted at most n^{l-3} times. Thus $|S| \ge (\varepsilon_2 n)^{l-1}/n^{l-3}$, contradicting (22).

Hence X is admissible. Take any $i \in [m]$ and consider moving x to V_i. By (20) the number of new bad pairs at x is at least $n/6m^{l-2} - \varepsilon_1 n > \varepsilon_2 mn$ and each one connects x to $\cup_{j \in \hat{\Gamma}_F(i)} V_j$. Hence x has more than $\varepsilon_2 n$ non-neighbors in some V_j with $j \in \hat{\Gamma}_F(i)$, meaning that $X \ne \hat{\Gamma}_F(i)$.

Since $i \in [m]$ was arbitrary and F is strict, we have that (17) holds. By (21), the part sizes are close to uniform, so

$$P(K_k^1, (G, x)) \geq (c_{k,l} + 2km\varepsilon_2)\binom{n-1}{k-1} - m(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2)n\binom{n-1}{k-2} + O(1/n).$$

Claim 19 and the extremality of G imply that

$$P(K_k^1, (G, x)) \leq \frac{k\, f(n, k, l)}{n} + \binom{n-2}{k-2}.$$

However, the last two inequalities contradicts (18). This proves Theorem 16. ∎

4.2 Verifying Theorem 3

Theorems 2 and 16 imply Theorem 3 provided we can verify that the appropriately defined F is strict. The cases $F = \overline{K}_3$ or C_5 are routine to verify (including the claim that $\overline{T}_3(n)$ is the (unique) optimal expansion of $\overline{K}_3$ for $(k, l) = (3, 4)$).

Let us check that $\overline{L}$ satisfies Theorem 16. Let $(k, l) = (6, 3)$ or $(7, 3)$. We already know by Theorems 2 that $\overline{L}$ is a stability graph for (k, l). Let $X \subseteq V(L)$ be any admissible set, meaning that $Y = V(L) \setminus X$ spans no edge in L. By the vertex-transitivity of L, we can assume that $00000 \in Y$. Thus all other sequences in Y have weight 2 and, furthermore, no two such sequences can have 1s in disjoint positions. If $|Y| = 5$, then up to a symmetry the only possibility is $Y = \{00000, 00011, 00101, 01001, 10001\}$ but then X is precisely the closed neighborhood of 11110 in $\overline{L}$. If $|Y| = 4$ and X does not contain a closed neighborhood, then, up to an automorphism of L, we have $Y = \{00000, 00011, 00101, 00110\}$. The code `scripts/Clebsh.nb` shows that, if $k = 6$, then $\mathrm{grad}(X) = 1437/2^{16} > c_{6,3}$ and if $k = 7$, then $\mathrm{grad}(X) = 14503/2^{21} > c_{7,3}$. Every other Y is a subset of one of the sets that we have already considered; then the gradient of $X = V(L) \setminus Y$ is as least as large as before. Thus $\overline{L}$ is strict. This finishes the remaining cases of Theorem 3.

5 Concluding Remarks

Let the *Ramsey number* $R(s, t)$ be the smallest n such that every order-n graph has an s-clique or an independent set of size t. Call a graph G *extremal* (s, t)*-Ramsey* if G has neither K_s nor $\overline{K}_l$ as an induced subgraph while the order of G is $R(s, t) - 1$, that is, maximum possible. Das et al [5] asked if for every (k, l) and large n, the value of $f(n, k, l)$ is attained by an expansion of some extremal Ramsey graph. The cases $(k, l) = (6, 3)$ and $(7, 3)$ that we solved here show that the answer is in the negative. Interestingly, $\overline{L}$ is nonetheless related to the Ramsey numbers, but the 3-color ones: Kalbfleisch and Stanton [11] showed that there are two different 3-edge-colorings of K_{16} without a monochromatic triangle but each color class (in either coloring) is isomorphic to the Clebsch graph (and thus the union of any two color classes is isomorphic to $\overline{L}$).

Das et al [5, Section 6] mention that they ran the SDP-solver for the cases $(k, l) = (5, 3)$, $(3, 5)$ and $(3, 6)$ and the obtained floating-point bound suggested that $c_{5,3} = 31/625$, $c_{3,5} = 1/16$, and $c_{3,6} = 1/25$ with extremal configurations being an expansion of respectively C_5, $\overline{K}_4$ and $\overline{K}_5$. Since their paper was already quite long they did not try to convert it into a rigorous proof. The current paper proves that indeed $c_{5,3} = 31/625$ and Vaughan [21] confirms the other two values (and shows that $c_{3,7} = 1/36$). It would be interesting to identify further pairs (k, l) amenable to this approach.

Acknowledgments

The author is very grateful to Emil Vaughan for helpful discussions and for writing such useful and versatile package as *Flagmatic*.

References

[1] N. Alon, E. Fischer, M. Krivelevich, and M. Szegedy. Efficient testing of large graphs. *Combinatorica*, 20:451–476, 2000.

[2] R. Baber and J. Talbot. Hypergraphs do jump. *Combin. Probab. Computing*, 20:161–171, 2011.

[3] B. Bollobás. *Extremal Graph Theory.* Academic Press, London, 1978.

[4] J. Cummings, D. Král', F. Pfender, K. Sperfeld, A. Treglown, and M. Young. Monochromatic triangles in three-coloured graphs. E-print `arXiv:1206.1987`, 2012.

[5] S. Das, H. Huang, J. Ma, H. Naves, and B. Sudakov. A problem of Erdős on the minimum number of k-cliques. E-print: `arxiv.org:1203.2723`, 2012.

[6] P. Erdős. On the number of complete subgraphs contained in certain graphs. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.*, 7:459–464, 1962.

[7] V. Falgas-Ravry and E. R. Vaughan. On applications of Razborov's flag algebra calculus to extremal 3-graph theory. E-print `arxiv.org:1110.1623`, 2011.

[8] V. Falgas-Ravry and E. R. Vaughan. Turán H-densities for 3-graphs. E-print `arxiv.org:1201.4326`, 2012.

[9] A. W. Goodman. On sets of acquaintances and strangers at any party. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 66:778–783, 1959.

[10] H. Hatami, J. Hladký, D. Král, S. Norine, and A. Razborov. On the number of pentagons in triangle-free graphs. E-print `arXiv:1102.1634`, 2011.

[11] J. G. Kalbfleisch and R. G. Stanton. On the maximal triangle-free edge-chromatic graphs in three colors. *J. Combinatorial Theory*, 5:9–20, 1968.

[12] G. Lorden. Blue-empty chromatic graphs. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 69:114–120, 1962.

[13] V. Nikiforov. On the minimum number of k-cliques in graphs with restricted number of independence. *Combin. Probab. Computing*, 10:361–366, 2001.

[14] V. Nikiforov. The minimum number of 4-cliques in a graph with triangle-free complement. E-Print `arxiv.org:math/050121`, 2005.

[15] O. Pikhurko. The minimum size of 3-graphs without four vertices spanning no or exactly three edges. *Europ. J. Combin.*, 23:1142–1155, 2011.

[16] F. P. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 30:264–286, 1930.

[17] A. Razborov. Flag algebras. *J. Symb. Logic*, 72:1239–1282, 2007.

[18] A. Razborov. On 3-hypergraphs with forbidden 4-vertex configurations. *SIAM J. Discr. Math.*, 24:946–963, 2010.

[19] A. Thomason. The simplest case of Ramsey's theorem. In *Paul Erdős and his Mathematics*, volume 11 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Studies*, pages 667–695. Springer Verlag, 2002.

[20] E. R. Vaughan. Flagmatic: A tool for researchers in extremal graph theory, 2012. Version 1.5, http://flagmatic.org/.

[21] E. R. Vaughan. Minimum triangle density in graphs of bounded independence number. In preparation, 2012.